

Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, February 23, 2000
8:30 A.M. – 5:30 P.M.
Marine Center Classroom (upstairs)
125 Harbor Way Santa Barbara, California

Meeting Summary

In Attendance:

Patricia Wolf, Chair
Matt Pickett, Co-Chair
Locky Brown
Warner Chabot
Ed Cassano
Dave Parker (alt. for Patty Wolf)
Gary Davis
Robert Fletcher
Craig Fusaro
Dale Glantz
Neil Guglielmo
Mark Helvey
Deborah McArdle
Michael McGinnis
Chris Miller
Tom Raftican

Merritt McRae (alt. for Tom Raftican)
Steve Roberson
Kathy DeWitt-Olson (alt. for Steve Roberson)
Bruce Steele (SAC) (alt. for Marla Dailey)

Michael Eng, Facilitator
John Jostes, Facilitator

Staff from CINMS/DFG: Sean Hastings, Satie
Airame, Ben Waltenberger, Cathryn Wild, Mike
Murray, Jesse Swanhuysen, Mettja Hong, Mary
Bergen

Members of the public

("alt." designates alternate for primary working
group member)

- 1. Welcome and Introductions:** The meeting opened up with a discussion of groundrules. Bruce Steel, commercial fisherman and member of the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) announced he was sitting at the table as an alternate for Marla Daily, public at large member and also a member of the SAC. Members of the Working Group were polled to clarify the acceptability of one member designating a member of another constituency to sit at the table as their interim alternate, when their designated alternate was not able to attend. It was the consensus of the Working Group to allow Mr. Steele to sit as Ms. Daily's alternate for the day given the unique circumstances and the lack of specific groundrules governing such a situation. Co-Chairs Patty Wolf and Ed Cassano then led the introductions of those present. Matt Pickett was introduced in his current position of Assistant Sanctuary Manager and alternate co-chair for Ed Cassano. Matt will assume the position of Sanctuary Manager following Ed's transfer from the Sanctuary Manager position in the spring. Ed Cassano then announced that Matt Pickett would serve as the Co-Chair from this point forward. Patty welcomed Matt and thanked Ed for the time and tremendous energy and leadership he has put into the Working Group. She then introduced Mary Bergen as the Marine Science Advisor to the Department of Fish and Game. Facilitator Mike Eng made the announcement of his new position in Arizona with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, though he does intend to finish out this project. Members of the Working Group and the public attendees introduced themselves.
- 2. Adoption of Meeting Summary from January 10 & 11, 2000 Working Group Meeting:** John Jostes led the group in a review of the meeting summary of its January meeting. Craig Fusaro and Tom Raftican suggested minor changes and corrections. The changes were accepted by a consensus of the Working Group as follows.
 - Re: item 7 day 1, and action item list: current versions of Working Group definitions of goals, objectives, other terms will be referred to as "working" definitions, rather than "operational definitions".
 - Re: page 2 of day 2, item 3: last bullet under GIS-based discussion should read that summing results will be statistically invalid.

- Re: summary of action items: "Species of Concern List" should read "Draft Species of Concern List."
- Day 2 header currently reads "Monday January 11th," should read "Tuesday, January 11th."
- Re: discussion of GIS tool should include comment that the group agreed that they would further discuss usefulness/appropriateness of the GIS tool.
- Socioeconomic task group was mis-characterized as the Reserve Administration task group.

Regarding the day's meeting agenda, he suggested Item 4 on today's agenda be moved to follow Item 3(c). Item 3(e) would be moved toward the end of the day. The revised meeting summary was adopted by a consensus of the Working Group.

3 Process, Structure, and Communications Issues

(A). January Public Forum Update: John Jostes opened the discussion of the public forum held in Oxnard indicating that it resulted in a successful dialogue on the issues and concerns surrounding the marine reserve process being undertaken by the Working Group. He noted that it is important MRWG make the best use of the feedback received. Several members of the Working Group commended the idea for roundtable discussions because it was very successful to their surprise and said they received lots of positive feedback from their constituents. Concerns were expressed about holding future public forums on the same day as a MRWG meeting and Sean Hastings felt the need for better constituent outreach so more groups are represented next time.

Other general discussion points:

- Links, or perceived links, and potential confusion between the MRWG process and other processes and issues related to marine management, agencies, etc., may be occurring and may continue to occur.
- Fishers have difficulty negotiating in this process when unsure of other restrictions that may be imposed in the future.
- A desired outcome of this process is a strong interagency understanding regarding implementation.
- A map of the Sanctuary and Southern California Bight region would be useful for the next forum.

Additionally, several Working Group members provided specific feedback from their constituents on the forum, and subsequent discussions:

Neil Guglielmo reported a synthesis of comments/feedback from his constituents in regard to the effectiveness of the meeting:

- Answers received by attendees (to some questions asked at the meeting) were described as inadequate.
- The use of best available information in the decision-making process was considered inadequate.
- The meeting on brown pelican-fishing interaction, held by the Department of Fish and Game, was confused with the reserve issue by some forum attendees.
- A need exists for additional information on the process.
- Some attendees believe that the MRWG process is a smoke screen—that decisions on reserves have already been made.

Chris Miller reported a synthesis of comments from his constituents/feedback in regard to the effectiveness of the meeting:

- It would be useful to have the fishing representatives on the MRWG at the table with CINMS and DFG.
- Directive from the Fish and Game Commission regarding this process remains unclear.
- It is also unclear as to whether this process is truly a community process or a NOAA-driven process.
- The lack of interagency cooperation (DFG, CINMS, USFWS) as exhibited at the brown pelican-fishing interaction meeting remains a strong concern for fishers in regard to the MRWG process.

Facilitator Mike Eng led the group in discussion of the seven themes gathered from the public forum. Working Group members were assigned to each category and summarized the concerns under three questions:

- What were the key messages from the public forum to MRWG?
- What are key suggestions about the process that MRWG should incorporate in future activities and forums?
- What are key issues/concerns needing better definition or articulation?

Groups reported back with their responses and recommendations as follows:

Category 1: Economic Impact:

- Priority concern is the adverse impact on recreational and commercial fishing. Three subsets include:
 - Activities: How much will it be reduced?
 - Areas: What areas will be restricted
 - Income: How much income will be reduced
- What other economic activities will be impacted?
- Justification for Marine Reserves
- Continued access to healthy stocks
- Possible mitigation for adverse economic impacts?
- How did we get here?
 - Timeline
 - Who decides?
 - When, How?
- Is re-opening of existing and potential marine reserves an option?

Group 2: Role of Science

- Priority concern is that science is poorly understood and trusted
- Uncertainty is very confusing
- "Test" reserves scientifically
- Need to better define the problem/issues to be resolved by MRWG process

Group 3: Structure/ Fairness of the Process

- Don't throw out complete list of concerns, but the primary one regards a timeline for this whole process. There is not enough time for real collaboration and participation
- Feedback/communication on input provided. It needs to be 2-way and follow-up is needed as well.

Group 4: Communications

- Primary concern is the problem with access to information
- Accuracy of information
- The[??] was information was being used
- "Clearing house" for information (to better define it)
- Posting information at harbors, landings, and boat ramps
- Get our website address out
- Utilize media to get information out (ex. Holding a press conference in advance to public forum)
- Clarify "sustainability"
- Information dissemination now currently by word of mouth (inaccuracies)

Group 5: Reserve Design

- Primary concern is we need good science involved in designing reserves
- What are goals of reserves? What are they suppose to do?
- Coordinate design with benefiting species
- What public access will be permitted?
- Rotational closures?
- Consider environmental fluctuations
- Review and monitoring
- Use local knowledge
- Keep it "simple" (design, boundaries, landmarks, depth, etc.)

- Wilderness?

Group 6: Issues Definition

- Primary concern is problem definition--What problems are reserves suppose to answer?
 - ⇒ Multiple observations of changes/problems in environment
- Necessary insurance policy; Will help in the recovery of certain species
- Other possible solutions to problems in addition to or instead of reserves
- Other "tools in a toolbox" for fisheries management
- Enforcement concerns
- Articulate problem concerns (possible solution)

Group 7: Miscellaneous

- Commercial fisherman have an economic incentive for sustainability
- How will reserves be impacted by outside events (ex. El Nino, water quality, etc.)

(B) Updates from Working Group Members on Constituent Meetings and Communications: John Jostes led the Working Group in this discussion and reiterated the importance of regular communication with participant constituencies. He noted that future meetings will provide an opportunity for participants to briefly summarize their outreach efforts. The following members gave input on their progress with constituent outreach:

Tom Raftican, Merritt McRae, Bob Fletcher: Held meeting with about twenty boat skippers, communication was focused on "just talking to them" and sharing information on this effort to institute marine reserves, other processes working on marine reserves e.g., Pacific Fishery Management Council ad hoc committee.

Warner Chabot: Forwards documents from Sanctuary, etc., to list of interested people, including national environmental organizations.

Locky Brown: Summarizing information in regular monthly column of Channel Islands Council newsletter. Also sent letter to dive boats and shops and dive club president.

Mark Helvey: No outreach to date.

Chris Miller: Met with Milton Love, Kevin Lafferty, Jen Cassal, then did outreach to constituents. After the January 20th forum, many fishers were aware of the process. Ventura County Fishermen's Association had several meetings, agreed to work on organization. This meeting resulted in the drafting of a handout, "Re: Fisheries Social and Economic data assimilation for the Marine Reserves Working Group" which was distributed to MRWG members at this time and discussed. The handout has also been distributed to regional fishing organizations as a communication and consensus tool within the fishing community.

Bruce Steele: The PCFFA has provided some funding for organization of fishers on the west coast which is helping with the process described by Chris Miller. Self-funding outreach is a poor option—an onerous burden financially and time-wise.

Steve Roberson: Outreach is focused on the Channel Islands Marine Restoration Committee and that is the limit given time and resource availability.

Neil Guglielmo: A California Squid Fishers Association has recently organized, he is on the Board of Directors. Hopes to have monthly newsletter in the near future. Feedback from Association: 1) major concern is economic impact, 2) want to be involved in decision, 3) if reserves are implemented, they need to be effective.

Gary Davis: National Park Service website is already linked to the Sanctuary site. He provides regular post-MRWG meeting updates to the San Francisco regional office, also gave presentation to the other park superintendents and managers, Secretary of the Interior and Science Advisory Panel, National Parks and Conservation Association.

Matt Pickett: Weekly status reports to Sanctuary headquarters, other Sanctuary managers, headquarters team associated with management plan review is also in the loop on this process.

Patty Wolf: Reports to Fish and Game Commission at each meeting regarding this process. Mary Bergen will provide an additional link to the Directors office. Week Ahead report includes news on this process, a possible additional item could be a column in the marine region newsletter. Will check on links from DFG site to CINMS site.

Dale Glantz: Considers his company and other kelp harvesters statewide to be his constituency—these groups are being kept up to date. To date, three general areas of feedback: 1) buy-in to the process is not occurring within the kelp industry because benefits to kelp are perceived to be minimal or non-existent, 2) in contrast, agreement exists on value of wilderness areas, 3) ready to discuss specifics of locations, etc.

Mike McGinnis: Has received two grants to institutionalize a community-based organization of spirited people who will work for wilderness in this area. Expects to be working with Southcoast Watershed Alliance, Conception Coast Project, others.

Alicia Stratton: (via fax) Occasionally attends monthly Surfrider meetings in Ventura. During the February meeting provided a comprehensive overview of the Sanctuary's management plan update process, the Sanctuary Advisory Council and MRWG. Will continue to update the Ventura Chapter later in the year. Provides updates including upcoming meetings and public workshops to Surfrider leaders via phone and email, who in turn pass the updates on to constituents. For upcoming public forums, will continue announcements at monthly meetings, pass on specific information regarding topics and agendas and encourage members to attend forums.

- 4 **Discussion of Constituent Outreach Plans:** John Jostes provided handouts to the Working Group he compiled on methods for better constituent outreach. The Working Group reviewed this handout and discussed why such relations are important and discussed additional suggestions for involving their members. Jostes stressed the importance for constituents to hear and convey the "other sides" of the dialogue, instead of reinforcing with their constituents the positions and concerns similar to their own views. Deborah McArdle indicated she felt the Working Group is not at the stage to "negotiate" with their constituents and there is further discussion over the fairness of the facilitators asking the Working Group to do so. Several members feel they need to identify clear objectives first before they can go back to their constituents. Both facilitators clarified that this handout was provided in preparation for when that time does come.

John Jostes reminded the Working Group to formalize their homework assignment in a one-page summary and submit it to the facilitators. MRWG is to summarize the techniques and strategy they will utilize for constituent outreach. The purpose of this assignment is to make sure such outreach is taking place.

- 5 **Meeting Notes and Questions from Science Panel Caucus on 1/11/2000:** Satie Airame provided an oral report to the Working Group summarizing her memo contained in the meeting materials previously distributed to Working Group members. Relevant discussion points or responses from the Working Group are shown below in *italics*.

- The Science Panel wanted to clarify that reserves do not offer protection for species whose entire life history is not captured with the reserve boundaries.

The MRWG does not expect reserves in this area to provide protection throughout the range of a stock, or to protect a designated % of the stock.

- The Panel is seeking clarification from the Working Group regarding the level of protection that the MRWG is seeking for the selected species of concern, e.g. does the group seek to sustain a population at 20%, 35% or 60% of estimated carrying capacity of the region?

The MRWG is most interested in which species and/or habitats are unique to this area and can truly benefit from the implementation of marine reserves. Currently, the Working Group feels better able to describe its goals in these practical terms.

Perhaps the Science Panel can answer this question for the group.

The effects of predation by marine mammals will need to be considered to accurately assess reserve effectiveness.

The MRWG expressed interest in compilation of regional baseline data and ongoing surveys.

The MRWG expressed general agreement that reserves can be expected to protect only the portion of the stock that is physically located the study area.

If local stock assessments are not available, how can we determine local status?

The question from the Panel regarding % level of protection could not be directly answered by the Working Group due to confusion over the definition of the term. However, the Group is interested in possible use of measures: density, or measure of "more and bigger". This discussion led to the question "What measurements, other than % of stock, can be used toward measuring levels of protection?" posed to the Science Panel:

- Does the MRWG want to maintain current or historic levels of density of various species?
- Does the MRWG want to replenish species in decline?

The MRWG is interested in replenishing species in decline, and in considering historic levels or densities of species.

- What is the timeline for review of this process and outcome?

Appropriate timeline will depend on several issues that may enter the decision including funding availability, and the species under consideration, (as the time to recovery will vary by species) and others. The MRWG suggested evaluation of public awareness, management, monitoring and enforcement of marine reserves in the short-term, at five years, and longer-term evaluation at 15-20 years of the success of marine reserves in meeting the goals/objectives determined by the Group.

Other discussion points from the group and Satie:

- The Status of the Resources Report, which is currently being produced by Tetra Tech for the management plan review, a site habitat characterization to be produced by Satie, and the anecdotal use information, currently being compiled by Mick Kronman, will provide additional useful information. These products should be available after April 19th.
- Representative habitats and ecological processes will be equally considered in reserve design, along with the designated species of concern.
- The formation of a Working Group/Science Panel joint task group was discussed briefly, with the goal of improving inter-group communication and overall progress on the process.

A model set of criteria developed by Craig Fusaro was provided. After production of the second draft list of Species of Concern, the Science Panel will review the list, note possible gaps, note additional species that are associated with selected species, or other useful comments. Bruce Steele voiced the last concern regarding cold versus warm complex species. We experienced a warm water complex for the last 25 years and now moving into a cold water complex. Those species that flourished in the warm water may not prosper after this change. We need to think in terms of future problems when considering which species to protect.

Two handouts were distributed to the group from Bruce Steele, "Goals and Objectives for the Marine Reserve Working Group" and "CFSI SeaNotes."

- 6 Discussion of Goals and Objectives and Task Group Caucuses:** MRWG broke into their individual task groups established at January's meeting and they announced the goals and objectives they came up with. Those that met previously and presented information included the Research and Education task group and the Socioeconomic task group.

Socioeconomic (Mark Helvey, Warner Chabot, Craig Fusaro):

The task group separated this goal area into two conceptual parts, long-term and short-term, and produced the following draft goal: "To achieve long-term economic productivity or sustainability while minimizing the short-term economic losses to all users." The group requested that the Working Group select either the term productivity, or sustainability.

The Working Group adopted the following as its working socioeconomic goal:

"To achieve long-term economic productivity while minimizing the short-term economic losses to all users."

The task group will seek to develop draft objectives for presentation to the entire Working Group at the next meeting.

Natural and Cultural Heritage/Recreation (Marla Daily, Deborah McArdle, Bruce Steele):

No progress on goals to date

Education and Research (Chris Miller, Sarah Fangman, Julie Goodson):

After some discussion by the group, the name of this task group was modified to "Research and Education".

The task group developed the following goals:

- to provide research areas in which the effectiveness of reserves as a fishery management tool can be evaluated on both a long-term and short-term basis.
- *to foster stewardship of living marine resources and habitats.*
- *to provide undisturbed research areas to monitor ecosystem functions and acquire baseline data to assess natural and human impacts to other areas.*
- *to provide educational opportunities for schools, colleges, universities and the public.*

The Working Group modified the first goal statement to read *"to provide research areas in which the effectiveness of reserves, for purposes such as fishery management tools, can be evaluated on both a long-term and short-term basis."*

The Working Group adopted the above statements as "working" Research and Education goals. The task group will seek to develop draft objectives for presentation to the entire Working Group at the next meeting

The facilitators want to do a reassessment and integration of all the information from today's meeting and feel we shouldn't hold a normal MRWG meeting on Thursday, March 16. Instead, it should be used as a working day for the task groups. Warner suggested that a few members from the S.P. should be invited to the next meeting to help things along.

- 7 **Formation of Commercial Fishing Data Collection Liaison Task Group:** Mike Eng led the discussion over Chris Miller's handout and suggested to establish a small task group to discuss the issues raised. It would be more efficient and the group could bring back recommendations to the larger Working Group where the final decisions would be made. In order for Chris Miller to reach his constituents, he needs feedback from MRWG so he can clarify whether or not the issues addressed are important/valid. Mike Eng then assigned eight volunteers from MRWG to this task group and left 2 spots open to be filled by commercial fisherman. Chris Miller will make the recommendation on who should fill these spots.

Handout List (distributed at this meeting, not previously distributed by mail or otherwise)

- ⇒ Goals and Objectives for the Marine Reserve Working Group, submitted by Bruce Steele
- ⇒ CFSI SeaNotes
- ⇒ Suggestions for undertaking Stakeholder/Constituent Outreach from John Jostes
- ⇒ Re: Fisheries Social and economic data assimilation for the Marine Reserves Working Group from Chris Miller

Upcoming MRWG Meeting Dates:

March 16, April 13, May 11, June 8

8. **Meeting Adjourned: 5:20 pm.**

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

1. All MRWG members that have web pages would benefit from linking to the CINMS and DFG pages.
2. A note regarding meeting dates should be placed on the CINMS website to clarify that the February 22nd public forum was canceled.
3. Each Working Group members is requested to submit by March 4, 2000, a 1 page description of their outreach plan, including the strategies, techniques, and audiences, (e.g. local and regional) as appropriate.
4. Sanctuary staff will seek to obtain an answer from the Science Panel regarding: What measurements, other than % of stock, can be used toward measuring levels of protection?
5. Working Group Members need to begin the process of shaping a second Draft Species of Concern List from the current Draft Species of Concern List. A set of detailed instructions and timeline will be emailed to the group from Satie within the next week. The revision process may be accomplished via either of two methods:
 - 1) Each member may establish their person set of selection criteria (e.g., economic importance, presence on Endangered Species List, species that indicate system changes) then review the Draft List per these criteria, select species and email these selections to Satie.
 - 2) Establish the criteria as above, email to Satie; she will review the list for the species that conform to the criteria.
6. Feedback was requested from the MRWG on Chris Miller's handout for transmittal from the Working Group to the fishing community via the fishing representatives on timeline and related questions of legitimacy raised earlier by the fishing representatives.
7. Additional homework for constituency outreach will be distributed to the group from the facilitators in advance of the next meeting March 16, 2000.